

REMARKS**A. 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In the Office action of 6 August 2010 (the “Office Action”), the examiner rejects claims 1–12, 16–24, 30, 32–35, and 56–69 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2006/0253449 by Williamson *et al.* (Office Action at 2.) It is respectfully submitted, however, that Williamson fails to teach or suggest several limitations of every claim.

Taking claim 1, for example, Williamson fails to teach or suggest at least the following limitations:

- items of legal information that are associated with one or more respective type tags, each type tag identifying a type of legal information corresponding to the associated item of legal information;
- a database storing the legal information in association with a plurality of types of legal information; and
- causing items to provided for display on a display device, automatically tabulated by the respective type tags.

Claim 1 refers to “item[s] of legal information,” each of which is:

associated with one or more respective topic tags and one or more respective type tags, each topic tag identifying a legal topic or subtopic associated with the associated item of legal information and each type tag identifying a type of legal information corresponding to the associated item of legal information.

Nothing in Williamson teaches or suggests the existence of types of legal information within the meaning of claim 1. To the contrary, Williamson relates to a system and method for drafting a legal document using a table of clauses. (¶ 0002.) Williamson discusses using a table in a database to store annotated contract clauses and

another table in a database to store outlines that serve as organization frameworks for contracts into which clauses can be inserted. (¶ 0015.)

A “type of legal information” within the meaning of claim 1 is not merely any classification of information. Indeed, the specification makes clear that a “class” of information is much broader than a “type.” The term “type of legal information” is consistently used in the application only to refer to classifications that relate to the legal import or authority of the legal information. (¶¶ 0008, 0015, 0021, and 0042.) The patent claims that explicitly recite types for inclusion in the plurality of types of legal information also consistently follow this usage. (See pending claims 2, 4, and 5.)

Thus, Williamson fails to teach or suggest types of legal information, as that term is used in the present application. Rather, Williamson discusses only outlines, clauses that the outlines can organize, terms within clauses, annotations, and indexes, all of which apply only to “contracts and similar forms of legal document.” (¶ 0035.) There is no suggestion of classifying information according to its legal significance, much less of the existence of types of legal information within the meaning of claim 1.

Necessarily, Williamson, fails to teach or suggest type tags that identify a type of legal information associated with an item of legal information. Indeed, Williamson fails to teach or suggest the existence or use of any tags for any purpose, much less the type tags claimed in the above-quoted section of claim 1. According to Williamson, the database is organized using tables, lists, and indices. (¶ 0042.) The tables may be maintained in a single, hierarchically structured table. *Id.* But none of these relationships or structures is the same as a type tag.

In connection with this limitation, the examiner cites Williamson at paragraphs 0014–15 and 0041–47. (Office Action at 3.) But paragraphs 0014–15 discuss only tables of clauses and a searchable topical index, and paragraphs 0041–47 merely describe that database structure in more detail. Neither cited portion has anything to say about tags, much less type tags that signify a type of legal information, as in claim 1.

Claim 1 also claims causing the items of legal information to be displayed, automatically tabulated according to their type tags. If Williamson fails to teach or

suggest types of legal information or type tags, it logically must fail to teach or suggest tabulation according to such tags.

In connection with tabulation by type of the items of legal information, the examiner cites Williamson at paragraphs 0051–54 and Figs. 4–6 (Office Action at 3.), but it is respectfully submitted that these portions of Williamson do not support a finding of anticipation. As claimed, each of the items of legal information is:

- associated with one or more type tags;
- displayed with other such items tabulated by type; and
- configured when displayed to be selectable such that selection of an item creates a request for display of content associated with the selected item.

No element in any figure of Williamson, or anywhere else in that reference, satisfies all of these limitations. Taking Fig. 4, for example, this is said to depict a clause selection module. (¶ 0051.) On the left side of the window is a topic listing, *id.*, but these topics are not the claimed items of legal information. As claim 1 claims, the items of legal information are not topics: they are stored in association with topics and are distinct from them. As for the clauses themselves, which may be organized by topic, they are neither tabulated by type nor selectable so as to generate a request for associated content.

It is respectfully submitted that no other element of Fig. 4 or the other figures reads on these limitations. It is further submitted that this may reflect the fundamental difference between the claimed invention and the subject matter of Williamson. Embodiments of the claimed invention relate to a system capable of associating items of legal information with legal topics and a plurality of types of legal information. (¶ 0041.) Types of legal information include, for example, administrative action, legislative action, rulemaking, reported judicial decisions, and news. (¶ 0042.) Williamson, in contrast, discusses drafting complex legal documents using a library of clauses and does not involve any such types of legal information. (Williamson at ¶ 0015.)

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art. Independent claims 30, 58, 68, and 69 include limitations that correspond to the limitations of independent claim 1 discussed above, and

it is submitted that these claims are allowable for the reasons discussed above. Claims 2–12, 16–24, 32–35, 56–57, and 59–67 depend directly or indirectly on one of claim 1 and claim 58, and it is submitted that these claims are therefore allowable based on their inclusion of allowable subject matter. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims are therefore respectfully requested.

B. Conclusion

For these reasons, the applicants respectfully request that the examiner withdraw the rejections and allow the claims. Additionally, although the applicants have set forth arguments that in their view suffice to establish the patentability of the pending claims over the cited prior art, for the sake of brevity, they have not responded to each assertion that was made in the Office Action. The applicants reserve the right to assert additional grounds for the patentability of any or all claims, and any lack of specific response to any comment relative to patentability that was made in the Office Action is not to be interpreted as acquiescence in the substance of any such comment.

To expedite prosecution of this application to allowance, the examiner is invited to call the applicants' undersigned representative to discuss any issues relating to this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6 January 2011

/Jon E. Gordon/

Jon E. Gordon
Reg. No. 55,217
Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP
745 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10151
Tel : (212) 588-0800
Fax: (212) 588-0500